DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 099 CG 014 497

AUTHOR Antonucci, Toni; And Others
TITLE Values and Self Esteem in Three Generations of Men and Women.
PUB DATE [78]
NOTE 19p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adults; *Age Differences; Cohort Analysis; *Family Attitudes; *Self Esteem; Semantic Differential; *Sex Differences; Socialization; Social Values; *Values; Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Rokeach Value Survey

ABSTRACT

Intergenerational differences within the family were examined through an exploration of values in three-generation intra-family triads. Subjects (N=180) were 30 male and 30 female white middle class triads. Each triad consisted of a son, father, paternal grandfather or daughter, mother, maternal grandmother. Generation ranges were: youngest, 17-23 years; middle, 39-50 years; and oldest, 61-83 years. Subjects rated 18 values on a semantic differential scale. The hypotheses of generational similarities in long-term, terminal values and generational differences in short-term, instrumental values were supported. The oldest generation rated instrumental values appropriate to retired life higher, while maintaining work-related values. More value similarities than differences were found between the sexes across generations, reflecting woman's role as a value transmitter. A predicted interaction of self-esteem and generation with values was minimally supported, warranting further research. (Author/NRB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED188099

CG

VALUES AND SELF ESTEEM IN THREE GENERATIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN

Toni Antonucci* and Nancy Gillett
Syracuse University

Frances W. Hoyer
Hutchings Psychiatric Center

CG 014497

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Toni Antonucci
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MAY 16 1980

VALUES AND SELF ESTEEM IN THREE GENERATIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN

Toni Antonucci* and Nancy Gillett
Syracuse University

Frances W. Hoyer
Hutchings Psychiatric Center

Running Head: Values and Self Esteem

CN 02823

Values and Self-Esteem in Three Generations of Men and Women

Intergenerational similarities and differences within the family can be investigated as a means of examining the relationship of values to different positions in developmental and historical time. The study reported below represents a preliminary exploration of value continuities and discontinuities in three generation intra-family triads. A within family generational approach seemed particularly appropriate for this study since family members are exposed to similar socialization experiences and yet as members of different generations and different cohorts possess unique life cycle perspectives and age related roles.

Researchers have explored generational similarities and differences, but the focus of this work has been varied. Diverse theoretical perspectives and the exploration of different variables have yielded confusing, if not contradictory results (Bengtson and Cutler, 1976). Bengtson and Cutler (1976) report generational differences in solidarity; Bengtson and Kupers (1971) discuss differences in developmental stake; and Payne, Summers, and Stewart (1973) found significant differences in moral judgements of three generation triads. However, Hill (1970) found large similarities across generations in values related to Fatalism and Optimism but differences regarding Childbearing. Similarly, Bengtson (1975) found differences in Materialism versus Humanism value orientations and similarities in Collectivism versus Individualism value orientations. Troll, Neugarten and Kraines (1969), investigating parents and their college-age children, reported greater similarities in values than in personality traits. Kalish and Johnson (1972) studying value orientations of three generations of women, found that similarities were not always between adjacent generations, and in fact, adjacent generations frequently evidenced the sharpest differences. Bengtson and Cutler (1976) also note this point in their recent review of the generation literature.

Two critical problems emerge with the study of values: one of definition and the other of operationalization. Rokeach (1968; 1973) has defined values

as important, relatively central, guiding principles in one's life. Bengtson (1975) similarly defines values as conceptions of desirable ends which serve as guides to action. These definitions generally reflect the conceptionalization of values used in the present study. Rokeach (1968), in an attempt to operationalize value systems, has dichotomized values into two types. These "instrumental" and "terminal" values differ primarily in focus. Instrumental values are thought to be relatively specific, goal-oriented guidelines of both personally and socially preferable behavior, e.g., Ambition, Capable. Terminal values on the other hand, are of a more significant nature, and represent "end-states of existence." These seem to be more general and enduring guiding life principles, e.g. Equality, Freedom. Several other studies have attempted to group or cluster values. Bengtson (1975; Bengtson & Lovejoy, 1976) factor analyzed a number of values and identified two major factors which were labelled Individualism versus Collectivism and Materialism versus Humanism. Recently, Jones, Sensenig and Ashmore (1978) also explored the underlying structure of value systems and compared spontaneously mentioned values with Rokeach's terminal and instrumental values. Although there was some overlap, Jones et al. (1978) found, using a multidimensional scaling procedure, that four dimensions emerged as important. Concern about Self versus Concern about Society emerged as important in two studies reported by this group whereas an Active versus Passive dimension emerged as important in only one study. It is clear that a large variety of techniques have been employed to explore the fundamental nature of value systems. These have yielded much information but not overwhelmingly consistent results.

The focus of the present research was to explore generational similarities and differences. It was hypothesized that values having to do with major life goals, the types of values Rokeach labelled terminal (1973), Bengtson (1975) labelled Humanism, Thomas (1974) labelled Core and Jones et al. (1978) labelled Concern with Society, would reflect stable socialization across age, generation and cohorts. If these are enduring end-states of existence such values may also be preserved within families. On the other hand, values which are less enduring are more specific and goal oriented may reflect differences across age, generation and cohorts since people within families will have been exposed to differences in the

socialization processes which affect short term goals. Those values labelled Instrumental (Rokeach, 1968), Materialism (Bengtson, 1975), Peripheral (Thomas, 1974), and/or Concerned with Self (Jones et al., 1978) would be of this type. In addition, of particular interest to us was work related values since the meaning of work seems to have changed over the years. Some people raised in the early part of the century may have perceived work as an important central part of life and a major factor in self definition. These people, however, are now in retirement and should therefore have reassessed their views of work. On the other hand, younger people, in the beginning or middle of their "work life" are likely to emphasize the importance of work. Indeed, Bengtson and Lovejoy (1976) referred to the effect of social age or status upon an individual's values. It was hypothesized that work related values would be differentially important to members of different generations. Specifically, previous data suggesting that older people become more hedonistic (Thurnher, 1974) and place less importance on instrumental values (Ryff and Baltes, 1976) seemed to indicate that perhaps as people get older they value things more appropriate to their status as retired persons and less appropriate to the work ethic. Consequently, it was predicted that younger people, both second and third generations, would rate work and work-related values higher than older, first generation people.

A corollary to the major hypotheses involved the relationship between values and self esteem. Although much research has been generated separately under the rubric of self esteem (adjustment, morale, self concept, etc.) and values (Cumming and Henry, 1961; Busse, 1969; Feather, 1970; Neugarten, Havighurst and Tobin, 1961; Rokeach, 1968), very little attention has been focussed on synthesizing these two areas. A final hypothesis concerned age appropriate values and their relationship to self esteem. Since some values seem age- and time-less, whereas others seem very age-specific, it was hypothesized that the maintenance of age inappropriate values would be negatively related to the self esteem of an individual. For example, younger and middle aged people, as members of the work force, should maintain work related values. However, older people retired and removed from the labor force, might retain work related values only at the price of a significant loss of self esteem. These people would be maintaining values inappropriate to their age which would precipitate an imbalance between age and age-

related values. It was predicted that this age/value relationship would be manifested through different interactional patterns of self esteem and values. People who maintained age inappropriate values were predicted to exhibit lower self esteem than those maintaining age appropriate values.

Method

Subjects

Thirty male and thirty female white, middle class triads participated in this study (N=180). Each triad consisted of a son, father and paternal grandfather or of a daughter, mother and maternal grandmother. Volunteers were obtained from students enrolled in college level psychology courses at a private northeastern college. The older generations were recruited by their college aged off-spring. As with all volunteer-based studies, the volunteer nature, as well as the overall size of the sample should be recognized as possible sources of bias. The age range for the youngest generation was 17-23 years (mean=19.4); the parent generation range was 39-50 years (mean=47.9); and the oldest generation age range was 61-83 years (mean=73.4).

Instruments

Values. Subjects were asked to rate 14 values on a semantic differential scale. Nine of these values were from Rokeach's Value Survey and were chosen on the basis of a factor analysis of the Rokeach scale (Antonucci, 1974). An attempt was made to represent the factors produced by that factor analysis. The terminal values included in the present study were: A Comfortable Life, Equality, An Exciting Life, Freedom, and A Sense of Accomplishment. The instrumental values included in the present study were: Ambition, Capability, Independent, and Intelligence. The values Cooperation, Education, Money, Success and Work were also measured because of their hypothesized relationship to a variety of age specific developmental tasks encompassed by the work sphere. The order in which the values were presented was counterbalanced.

The semantic differential technique developed by Osgood, Suci and Tannebaum (1957) was employed in the present study because it has been shown to be more successful for use with older people than the ranking technique employed by Rokeach (Antonucci, 1974). Osgood et al. (1957) have studied the semantic differential technique extensively and provide evidence of the reliability and validity of this approach. Six

pairs of bipolar adjectives representing the evaluative, that is, judgmental or attitudinal factor, of the semantic differential were used in the rating scales. These were good-bad, dishonest-honest, unfair-fair, pleasant-unpleasant, ugly-beautiful, nice-awful. The adjectives were located at each end of a 7 point scale. The locations of the positive and negative poles were counterbalanced on each rating sheet. The instructions read in part:

> If you feel that the word at the top of the page is VERY CLOSELY RELATED to one end of the scale, you should place your check- mark as follows:
>
> FAIR :_X_:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: UNFAIR
>
> OR
>
> FAIR :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_X_: UNFAIR

with similar examples for quite closely related, only slightly related, related and neutral or completely irrelevant. To obtain a score for a value, each space was assigned a value from 1-7 with 1 representing the negative pole and 7 the positive pole. The ratings were summed to obtain a score for each value. With this procedure, the lowest possible score was 6 and the highest 43.

Self Esteem. The self esteem measure employed in this study was adapted from Saltz (1971). She successfully used a similar measure as one of several assessments of self esteem in a study of foster grandparents. The scale consists of two semantic differential rating forms which measure actual self concept and ideal self concept. The respondents were asked to rate themselves on thirteen pairs of adjectives under the heading of "Mostly I am" and "Ideally I would like to be." A self esteem score was constructed on the basis of the discrepancy between the two forms. The order of presentation of ideal- and actual-self concept was counterbalanced.

The thirteen pairs of bipolar adjectives used for the self esteem scales were: happy-sad, contented-discontented, bored-busy, friendly-unfriendly, lonely-not lonely, excitable-calm, dependent-independent, adjusted-unadjusted, tired-energetic, healthy-unhealthy, satisfied-dissatisfied, young-old, useful-useless. The items were scaled and summed as described above and the discrepancy score computed. A median split was

used to divide scores into high and low self esteem categories. The range of scores for low self esteem was 0-11; high self esteem, 12-46.

Procedure

The college aged volunteers were each given a packet containing three sets of questionnaires: one to be filled out personally and the others to be distributed to the appropriate parent and grandparent. In order to provide some control of questionnaire administration, the directions for each set of questionnaires recommended that the respondents choose a quiet place to work alone, without interruption or discussion with others. Students were instructed orally that they could deliver the questionnaires in person or by mail as long as they did not engage in any detailed conversation with other members of the triad about specific questions or replies until all questionnaires had been completed in that family. This was also written on the first, introductory page of each questionnaire. The introduction emphasized that there were no right or wrong answers and stressed the exploratory nature of the study. The instructions read in part:

> We are interested in your attitudes and opinions on several different issues, and would like to emphasize that all responses in this questionnaire are considered unique and individually based....Please feel free to answer each part of the questionnaire honestly according to your feelings at the present time.

Results

A multivariate analysis of variance (Cramer, 1974) was performed to explore the relationship between the independent variables of Generation, Sex, and Self Esteem and the dependent variables, that is, the 14 values. This analysis indicates a triple (Generation x Sex x Self Esteem) interaction, $F(28,308)=1.77, p<.01$; a Sex x Self Esteem interaction, $F(14,154)=1.92$, $p<.02$; a main effect of Generation, $F(28,308)=4.83, p<.001$; and a borderline main effect of Sex, $F(14,154)=1.71, p<.058$. A series of univariate analyses were performed to clarify these effects.

The 3(Generation) x 2(Sex) x 2(Self Esteem) univariate analyses produces a borderline significant effect only for the value of Education, $F(2,167)=2.69, p<.07$. Thus, it appears that the triple interaction does not contribute substantially to our understanding of the relationships among these variables.

Univariate tests examining the 2(Sex) x 2(Self Esteem) interaction indicate that this effect is due primarily to the value placed on Intelligence, $F(1,167)=6.585, p<.01$. Simple effects tests suggest that this interaction reflects differences between low Self Esteem males and females, $F(1,167)=14.845, p<.001$. Low Self Esteem women placed the highest value on Intelligence (mean=37.81), whereas low Self Esteem men rated this value lowest (mean=34.34).

In order to explore the main effect of Generation, univariate tests were performed for each value. The results are reported in Table 1. It is interesting that when significant differences occur the oldest generation

---

Insert Table 1 about here

(G_1) rates the value highest, followed by the middle-aged (G_2) group, then by the youngest group (G_3). The differences between the G_1 and G_2 generations are significant as indicated by the Duncan's multiple range test on the following items: A Comfortable Life ($p<.05$), Education ($p<.05$), Independent ($p<.01$), Intelligence ($p<.05$), Money ($p<.01$), Success ($p<.05$), and Work ($p<.05$). There are significant differences between G_1 and G_3 for the values Ambition ($p<.01$), Capability ($p<.01$) Independent ($p<.01$), Intelligence ($p<.001$), Money ($p<.001$), and Work ($p<.001$) (See Table 1 for means). Significant differences between G_3 and G_2 were also found for the values Ambition ($p<.05$), Money ($p<.01$), Success ($p<.05$), and Work ($p<.01$) (See Table 1 for means). There are no generational differences for the values Rokeach labelled terminal, that is, Equality, An Exciting Life, Freedom, and A Sense of Accomplishment, or for the additional non-Rokeachian value Cooperation.

As reported above, the multivariate main effect of Sex reached a level of borderline significance. However, the univariate F tests suggests that the values of Ambition, $F(1,167)=4.57, p<.03$; Education, $F(1,167)=4.24, p<.04$; and Intelligence , $F(1,167)=7.85, p<.01$ discriminate between the sexes. The means for each value are higher for the women than for the men (see Table 1). There are no sex differences for the terminal values A Comfortable Life, Equality, An Exciting Life, Freedom, and A Sense of Accomplishment; for the instrumental values of Capability and Independence; or for the work related values Cooperation, Money, Success and Work.

To explore the nature of the intra-family patterns of values a series of correlations was performed comparing first (G_1) and second (G_2) generations; first (G_1) and third (G_3) generations; and second (G_2) and third (G_3) generation members of the same family. These intra-familial correlations yield few significant relationships (3 from a possible 42, hardly beyond the chance level).

To summarize: there are no generational differences in the Rokeachian terminal values of Equality, An Exciting Life, Freedom, and A Sense of Accomplishment. The one exception to this pattern is the significant generational difference for the terminal value A Comfortable Life. At the same time, there are consistent generational differences in the Rokeachian instrumental and the work related values: Ambition, Capability, Independent, Intelligence, Education, Money, Success, and Work. The one exception is the value Cooperation. Sex differences emerge for the values Ambition, Education and Intelligence; and a Sex x Self Esteem interaction emerges for the value Intelligence.

Discussion

The hypothesized relationship between generation and values is generally supported by our findings. All instrumental values showed generational differences whereas only one terminal value showed such a difference. The higher ratings assigned to instrumental values by older people seem consistent with the retired status of the oldest generation and suggests, as have other studies (Thurnher, 1974), that instrumental values become more important with age. The only terminal value which older people rated higher than other generations was A Comfortable Life. This terminal value does intuitively appear to be critical to older people since it is particularly during this age period that maintaining a reasonably comfortable existence may be threatened by financial or health strains. It should be noted, however, that these findings somewhat contradict Bengtson's (1975) results which indicated that grandparents and grandchildren tended toward Humanism and that parents tended toward Materialism. This apparent contradiction may be a reflection of the specific values used by Bengtson versus those in the present study or of differences in the standard of living of the two samples. Bengtson defined "Materialism" as financial comfort, respect or recognition from other people, possessions, and an attractive appearance;

whereas in the present study instrumental values included Ambition, Capability, Independent, and Intelligence.

The hypothesized relationship between generation and work-related values can be considered only partially supported. These values seem particularly important to the middle generation perhaps because they are now in the mainstream of the labor force and are generally focusing their lives on achievements associated with the "work ethic." It is surprising and contrary to our original hypothesis, however, that the oldest generation, regardless of self esteem, rated the work related values of Education, Money, Success, and Work even higher than the middle aged group for whom these values would appear to have greater salience. The fact that these older people maintain work-related values in retirement replicates Atchley's (1972) finding that retired women school teachers maintained a high positive work orientation after retirement and did not encounter personal adjustment problems as a result of retirement. Apparently older people do not abandon their work-related values but rather add to them a greater emphasis on instrumental values. It also seems possible that the oldest generation perceives work-related values as related to or the basis for a secure later life. Bengtson and Cutler (1976) have referred to generational differences in developmental stake. Different generation members have different investments or goals in their intra-generational relationships which allow the fulfillment of their personal goals. These may be reflected by the differences in instrumental and work-related values evidenced in the present study. At still another level, it should be recognized that these findings may be a reflection of cohort differences which are simply confounded by generation differences (Elder, 1975). The correlational evidence, which indicated few significant intra-family value correlations, would support such an explanation. In essence, this interpretation suggests that the age and generation differences reported in the present study are related not to age and generation membership per se but rather to the particular cohorts represented by these ages and generations.

There are no generational differences for the values Cooperation, Equality, An Exciting Life, Freedom and A Sense of Accomplishment. These last four are labelled terminal values by Rokeach. The lack of generational differences for these values suggests that they are less susceptible to generational, or similarly cohort, discontinuities. Cooperation is the only value which is not one of Rokeach's terminal values and did not yield generational differences. However, this value appears to be more similar to Rokeach's terminal (enduring end states of existence) type of values. Thus, the findings indicate that values which apppear to be central and permanent, that is, Terminal (Rokeach, 1968), Core (Thomas, 1974), Humanistic (Bengtson, 1975) or Concerned with Society (Jones, et al., 1978), are relatively consistent across the life span and are less related to one's particular age, cohort or status in life.

The finding that the older generation generally rated the values, whether work-related or not, higher than the younger generations might be considered an artifact related to a tendency for older people to score more extremely on the sematic differential scale. Armstrong and Scotzin (1974) in reporting a study in which a semantic differential scale was employed, noted that attitudes intensify with age. A related explanation for this general intensification, however, is that the oldest generation is strongly committed to a value system that, as a result of life time of experience, includes both work-related and retirement-related values. One might argue that the youngest generation with less life experience has not yet developed any real commitment to a particular or enduring value system. In fact, some data suggest that their lower value scores may reflect a degree of youthful alienation (Martin, Bengtson, and Acock, 1974).

The finding that,where there are sex differences, women rate values higher than men is consistent with Armstrong and Scotzin's (1974) finding that women have higher attitude intensities than men. Hill (1970) and Troll and Smith (1976) among others, have indicated that cross-generational ties are maintained principally by women. It may be that women play a key role in the transmission of values and that their higher value scores reflect that role. It is interesting to note that the particular values for which significant sex differences are found (Ambition, Education, Intelligence),are not stereotypically attributed to women but are generally esteemed by the culture. Perhaps women rate highly positive values not usually associated with them in reaction to our society's "traditional" view of women.

Analyses of sex differences indicate that there are no sex differences for the Terminal values A Comfortable Life, Equality, An Exciting Life, Freedom, and A Sense of Accomplishment. There are also no sex differences for the instrumental values of Capability and Independence or for the work-related values Cooperation, Money, Success and Work. These findings imply that there are more value (terminal, instrumental, and work-related values) similarities between the sexes across age, generation, and cohorts than there are value differences. This overall similarity in values may also be a reflection of women's role as value transmitters.

Support for the hypothesis that self esteem interacts with age and values must be considered minimal since interactions emerge in so few cases. We suspect that the hypothesis is too broad and the measures too crude to ascertain differences in hierarchical value orientations and self esteem across generations. A more detailed exploration of this hypothesis appears warranted.

In conclusion, the present findings provide some support for the hypotheses and suggest several areas in need of future investigation. The data indicate that the three generations do not differ on four of the five values Rokeach labelled terminal which were included in the present study. The findings also indicate that older people emphasize both the values Rokeach labelled instrumental and the values we called work-related. The oldest generation appears to hold a strong multifaceted value system which incorporates values appropriate to present, past and future roles and status. Apparently, the older generation continues to carry the dominant values of the society and perhaps maintains a role in the transmission of these values to the younger generation. Additionally, the present study cannot examine the very real possibility that the higher value intensity of the older generation may ensue from participation in a historical period in which value judgements were perceived as more absolute. Similarly, it may be that young and middle-aged respondents in this sample will maintain individual value hierarchies throughout their lifetime that incorporate not only family transmitted values but also contemporary societal values. In short, a cohort rather that an age explanation may be warranted. A cross-sequential study is necessary to provide the kind of data which would permit a determination of the relative contributions of age, generation and cohort to an individual's value hierarchy.

Summary

In this study, similarities and differences in values within families across three generations were examined. Thirty male and thirty female generational triads rated fourteen values on a semantic differential scale. These values were: a subsample of Rokeach's terminal values, defined as long-lasting central and enduring, such as, A Comfortable Life, Equality, An Exciting Life, Freedom, and A Sense of Accomplishment; a subsample of Rokeach's instrumental or goal-oriented, specific values, for example, Ambition, Capability, Independent, and Intelligence; and work-oriented or work-related values, such as Cooperation, Education, Money, Success, and Work. Participants were also asked to rate themselves as they were and as they would like to be on thirteen bipolar adjectives. The discrepancy between these two ratings was used as an approximate measure of self esteem. It was hypothesized that there would be generational similarities in terminal values but not in instrumental or work-related values and that values would be related to self esteem.

Hypotheses concerning generational differences in instrumental values and similarities in terminal values were generally supported. The oldest generation rated values appropriate to retired life higher and also maintained values associated with work and success. The youngest generation rated instrumental values lower than older generations. The findings indicate that older people emphasize instrumental values, but contrary to our prediction, not at the expense of work-related values. No significant generational effects were found for the terminal values of An Exciting Life, Equality, Freedom, and A Sense of Accomplishment. The oldest generation appears to hold a strong multi-faceted value system which incorporates values appropriate to their present, past, and future roles. Apparently, the older generation continues to carry the dominant values of the society and perhaps maintains a role or developmental stake in the transmission of these values to the younger generation.

Women rated Ambition, Education and Intelligence more highly than men. Overall, there seem to be more value (terminal, instrumental, and work-related) similarities between the sexes across generations than differences. This value similarity may be a reflection of women's role as value transmitters.

Support for a hypothesized interaction of self esteem and generation with values was minimal. The measures appear to have been too general to assess the hypothesized relationship.

References

Antonucci, Toni. On the relationship between values and adjustment in old men. International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 1974, 5(1), 57-69.

Armstrong, B. N., & Scotzin, M. N. Intergenerational comparison of attitudes toward basic life concepts. Journal of Psychology, 1974, 87, 293-304.

Atchley, R. C. The Social Forces in Later Life. Wadsworth, Belmont, California, 1972.

Bengtson, V. Generation and family effects in value socialization. American Sociological Review, 1975, 40, 358-371.

Bengtson, V. L. and Cutler, N. E. Generations and intergenerational relations: Perspectives on age groups and social change. In R. H. Binstock and E. Shanas (Eds.), Handbook of aging and the social sciences. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1976, 130-159.

Bengtson, V. L. & Kuypers, J.A. Generational differences and the developmental stake. Aging and Human Development, 1971, 2, 249-259.

Bengtson, V. S. & Lovejoy, M. C. Values, personality and social structure. American Behavioral Scientist, 1976, 16(6), 880-912.

Busse, E. W., & Pfeiffer, E. (Ed.). Behavior and adaptation in later years. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1969.

Cramer, E. Revised MANOVA Program. The L. L. Thurstone Psychometric Laboratory, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, May 1974.

Cumming, E., & Henry, W. E. Growing old. New York: Basic Books, 1961.

Elder, G. Age differentiation and the life course. Annual Review of Sociology, 1975, 1, 165-190.

Feather, N. T. Educational choice and student attitudes in relation to terminal and instrumental values. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1970, 22, 127-144.

Hill, R. Family Development in Three Generations. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1970.

Jones, R.A., Sensenig, J. and Ashmore, R. D. Systems of values and their multidimensional representations. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1978, 13(3), 255-271.

Kalish, R. A., & Johnson, A. I. Value similarities and differences in three generations of women. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34, 49-55.

Levine, R. L. Disengagement in the elderly--its causes and effects. Nursing Outlook, 1969, 17, 28-30.

Martin, W. C., Bengtson, V. L., & Acock, A.C. Alienation and age: A context-specific approach. Social Forces, 1974, 53(2), 266-274.

Neugarten, B. L., Havighurst, R., & Tobin, R. The means of life satisfaction. Gerontology, 1961, 16, 134.

Osgood, C., Suci, G. and Tannenbaum, P. The measurement of meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Payne, S., Summers, D.A., and Stewart, T.R. Value differences across three generations. Sociometry, 1973, 36(1), 20-30.

Rokeach, M. A. A theory of organization and change within value attitude systems. Journal of Social Issues, 1968, 24, 13-33.

Rokeach, M. The nature of human values. New York: Free Press, 1973.

Ryff, C. D., and Baltes, P. B. Value transition and adult development in women: The instrumentality sequence hypothesis. Developmental Psychology, 1976, 12, 567-568.

Saltz, R. Aging persons as child-care workers in a foster grandparent program: Psychosocial effects and work performance. Aging and Human Development, 1971, 3, 314-340.

Thomas, L.E. Generational discontinuity in beliefs: An exploration of the generation gap. The Journal of Social Issues, 1974, 30(3), 1-22.

Thurnher, M. Goals, values, and life evaluation at the preretirement stage. Journal of Gerontology, 1974, 29, 85-96.

Troll, L., Neugarten, B., and Kraines, R. Similarities on values and other personality characteristics in college students and their parents. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1969, 15, 323-337.

Troll, L., and Smith, J. Attachment through the life span: Some questions about dyadic bonds among adults. Human Development, 1976, 19(3), 156-171.

Footnotes

*Reprints may be requested from: Toni Antonucci, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106. Special thanks to James S. Jackson and Lillian Troll for a critical reading of an earlier version of this manuscript.

Table 1

Part 1: Mean value Scores for Generation, Sex, and Self Esteem

Values	Generations			Sex		Self-Esteem	
	Old	Middle Age	Young	Male	Female	High	Low
Ambition	37.29	35.00	32.74	34.15	38.87	35.23	34.80
Capability	37.90	35.35	33.75	35.06	36.30	35.99	35.37
Comfortable Life	38.20	36.33	35.45	35.99	37.33	37.04	36.28
Cooperation	38.20	36.59	35.91	36.89	36.91	36.44	37.36
Education	37.54	35.36	34.74	35.16	36.60	35.84	35.91
Equality	35.29	34.70	36.02	34.85	36.49	38.03	38.24
Exciting Life	34.47	32.53	34.88	33.76	34.15	34.83	33.09
Freedom	37.92	36.89	37.50	37.56	37.32	37.22	37.65
Independent	37.39	35.10	35.01	35.26	36.41	35.65	36.02
Intelligence	37.99	35.42	35.02	35.17	37.12	36.07	36.21
Money	36.00	33.71	29.36	32.50	33.54	33.48	32.57
Sense of Accomplishment	38.97	38.39	37.94	37.70	38.56	38.02	38.24
Success	37.04	35.20	33.24	34.60	35.72	35.71	34.61
Work	38.45	35.74	31.77	35.02	35.62	35.02	35.62

Part 2: Univariate F-tests for Values by Generation

Terminal		Instrumental		Work	
Value	F	Value	F	Value	F
A Comfortable Life	4.89**	Ambition	11.58***	Cooperation	1.07
Equality	2.37	Capability	9.19***	Education	5.86**
An Exciting Life	< 1	Independent	4.91**	Money	22.65***
Freedom	1.11	Intelligence	7.43***	Success	9.31***
A Sense of Accomplishment	< 1			Work	22.54***

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001